09/772,606                                                                                MS164006.1

## REMARKS

Claims 1-45 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. A version of all pending claims is found at pages 2-9. Claims 15, 20, 26, 30-31 and 34-35 have been amended to cure minor informalities. Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and comments herein.

### I.    Objection to Claims 20, 26, 34-35

Claims 20, 26, 34-35 are objected to because of minor informalities. These claims have been amended herein to cure such informalities, and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

### II.    Rejection of Claims 1-8, 27, 32, 38-39 and 42-45 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-8, 27, 32, 38-39 and 42-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Isreal *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,330,007). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reason. Isreal fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation set forth in the claimed invention.

> A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it *expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation* set forth in the patent claim. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California,* 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.,* 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added).

### i.    Independent Claims 1, 27, 32, 38, 42 and 44

Applicants' claimed invention is directed towards mitigation of pixilation and/or disproportionate appearance of themed images when images are sized and/or scaled. Independent claims 1, 27, 32, 38, 42 and 44 similarly recite *a sizing module*

10

*adapted to size a first component in response to the sizing input; and an alignment module adapted to align a second component within the sized first component.* The claimed invention clearly relates to a system and method for sizing and resizing, and aligning user interface elements based upon supplied sizing information in order to mitigate pixilation and/or the disproportionate appearance of themed images when images are resized and/or scaled. In particular, applicants' claimed invention utilizes a first component that is sized according to supplied sizing information by a sizing module, and subsequently an alignment module is used to align a second component within the previously sized first component. Isreal *et al.* does not teach or suggest these novel limitations.

Isreal *et al.* relates to a prototyping and specification tool for designing dynamic user interaction screens using a database. *See*, col. 1, lines 63-65. Nowhere does Isreal *et al.* teach or suggest utilization of a *sizing module to size a first component* in response to a sizing input, and thereupon the use of second module to align a second component within the sized first component. Isreal *et al.* simply teaches an approach to create forms for use by subsequent users whereby electronic receipt data is inserted into a grid of *predetermined* size that allows *entry and editing and alignment* of electronic receipt data within the grid. It is apparent that Isreal *et al.* fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation set forth in the applicants' claimed invention. According, it is submitted that this rejection be withdrawn with respect to independent claims 1, 27, 32, 38, 42 and 44 (and claims that depend there from).

### ii.     Independent Claims 4 and 7

Independent claims 4 and 7 recite: *dividing a bitmapped first component into a plurality of grids.* Applicants' claimed invention as stated *supra*, is directed towards mitigation of pixilation and/or the disproportionate appearance of themed images when images are sized and/or scaled. The subject invention as claimed achieves mitigation of pixilation and disproportionate appearance of themed images by dividing the bitmapped first component into a plurality of grids that are used to either expand or compress bitmapped components according to a received sizing input. Isreal *et al.* does

11

not teach or suggest this exemplary feature. In fact, nowhere in Isreal *et al.* is it taught or suggested that a ***bitmapped component can be divided into a plurality of grids*** to be subsequently used to expand or compress, and align, the bitmapped component according to a received sizing input. Accordingly, it is submitted that this rejection of independent claims 4 and 7, and those claims that depend there from be withdrawn.

**III.     Rejection of Claims 9, 16, 18 and 22 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claims 9, 16, 18 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Higgins *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,477,241). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reason. Higgins *et al.* fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation set forth in applicant's claimed invention.

Independent claims 9, 16, and 22 recited similar claim limitations, namely: *a sizing module adapted to size the bitmapped component in response to the sizing input and based upon a functional relationship between the DPI of the context that the UI element is being rendered to and the DPI that the bitmapped component was designed under.* In particular, the claimed invention utilizes a sizing module to size a bitmapped component based upon sizing input that is received together with the functional relationship between the *DPI of the context that the themed element is to be rendered to, e.g.,* the DPI of the ultimate product is dependent upon the context into which the themed element is to be placed into, and the *DPI that the bitmapped component was designed under.* Higgins *et al.* does not teach or suggest this functionality.

Higgins *et al.* relates to a mechanism for adjusting selected *video display* characteristics in a computer system. Higgins *et al.* simply teaches a mechanism for controlling the number of dots that are to be displayed on a video screen per inch of printed output. Higgins *et al.* does not teach or suggest a sizing module that is capable of resizing a *bitmapped component* in relation to the DPI of the context that the themed element is to be rendered to, while simultaneously accounting for conditions under which the *bitmapped component* was created, thereby mitigating pixilation and the disproportionate appearance of the resized/scaled elements. It is apparent therefore, that

12

Higgins *et al.* does not teach each and every claim limitation recited in applicants' claimed invention, and accordingly it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

**IV.     Rejection of Claims 10-15, 17, 19-21 and 23-26 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 10-15, 17, 19-21 and 23-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Higgins *et al.* as applied to claims 9, 16, 18 and 22, and further in view of Isreal *et al.* It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reason. Claims 10-15, 17, 19-21 and 23-26 depend from independent claims 9, 16 and 22 respectively, and Isreal *et al.* does not rectify the aforementioned deficiencies presented by Higgins *et al.* with respect to independent claims 9, 16 and 22, as discussed above. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of claims 10-15, 17, 19-21 and 23-26 is respectfully requested.

**V.     Rejection of Claims 29-31, 33-35, 37 and 40-41 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 29-31, 33-35, 37 and 40-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Isreal *et al.* as applied to claims 27, 32 and 38, and further in view of Higgins *et al.* It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reason. Claims 29-31, 33-35, 37 and 40-41 depend from independent claims 27, 32 and 38 respectively, and Higgins *et al.* does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies presented by Isreal *et al.* with respect to independent claims 27, 32 and 38, as discussed *supra*. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn and claims 29-31, 33-35, 37 and 40-41 be allowed.

09/772,606                                                                          MS164006.1

## CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above amendments and comments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063.

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP

Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731

14